

1 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
2 Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996  
3 Facsimile (702) 949-8321  
4 Telephone (702) 949-8320

5 Robert M. Charles, Jr. NV State Bar No. 006593  
6 Email: rcharles@lrlaw.com  
7 John Hinderaker AZ State Bar No. 018024  
8 Email: jhinderaker@lrlaw.com  
9 Marvin Ruth NV State Bar No. 10979  
10 Email: mruth@lrlaw.com

11 Attorneys for USACM Liquidating Trust

12 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
13 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

14 In re:

15 USA Commercial Mortgage Company,

16 Debtor.

17 Case No. BK-S-06-10725-LBR

18 Chapter 11

19 **FIRST OMNIBUS OBJECTION OF**  
20 **USACM TRUST TO PROOFS OF**  
21 **CLAIM BASED ENTIRELY UPON**  
22 **INVESTMENT IN THE BUNDY**  
23 **CANYON (\$2.5 MILLION) LOAN**

24 Hearing Date: August 30, 2011

25 Hearing Time: 10:30 a.m.

26 Estimated Time for Hearing: 10 minutes

16 The USACM Liquidating Trust (the “USACM Trust”) moves this Court, pursuant  
17 to § 502 of title 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code (the “Bankruptcy Code”) and  
18 Rule 3007 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure (the “Bankruptcy Rules”), for an  
19 order disallowing 80% and allowing 20% of each Proof of Claim listed in **Exhibit A**.

20 These claims were filed by investors (“Direct Lenders”) against USA Commercial  
21 Mortgage Company (“USACM”) based entirely upon an investment in a loan to Bundy  
22 Canyon Land Development, LLC (the “Borrower”). This loan was one of several to the  
23 Borrower, and will be referred to here as the “Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan.” This  
24 Objection is supported by the Court’s record and the Declarations of Geoffrey L. Berman  
25 and Edward M. Burr in Support of Omnibus Objections to Proofs of Claim Based Upon

1 the Investment in the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan. (the “Berman Decl.” and “Burr  
2 Decl.”).

3 THIS OBJECTION DOES NOT RELATE TO AND WILL NOT IMPACT THE  
4 DIRECT LENDERS’ RIGHTS TO REPAYMENT ON THE BUNDY CANYON (\$2.5  
5 MILLION) LOAN, SHARE IN ANY PROCEEDS GENERATED FROM THE SALE OF  
6 THE REAL PROPERTY SECURING THE BUNDY CANYON (\$2.5 MILLION) LOAN,  
7 OR SHARE IN THE RECOVERY OF ANY FUNDS FROM THE GUARANTOR FOR  
8 THE LOAN.

9 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

10 **I. BACKGROUND FACTS**

11 **a. The USACM Bankruptcy**

12 On April 13, 2006 (“Petition Date”), USACM filed a voluntary petition for relief  
13 under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code. Debtor continued to operate its business as  
14 debtor-in-possession pursuant to sections 1107(a) and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code.  
15 Debtor’s post-petition management of the Debtor was under the direction of Thomas J.  
16 Allison of Mesirow Financial Interim Management, LLC, who served as the Chief  
17 Restructuring Officer.

18 USACM was a Nevada corporation that, prior to the Petition Date, was in the  
19 business of underwriting, originating, brokering, funding and servicing commercial loans  
20 primarily secured by real estate, both on behalf of investors and for its own account. That  
21 business included the solicitation of investors to purchase fractional interest in loans that  
22 USACM originated and then serviced. These investors are referred to as “Direct Lenders”  
23 in USACM’s bankruptcy case and in this Objection.

24 On January 8, 2007, this Court entered its Order Confirming the “Debtors’ Third  
25 Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Reorganization” as Modified Herein [Docket No.  
26 2376]. As part of the Plan, and pursuant to an Asset Purchase Agreement filed with this

1 Court, USACM sold the servicing rights to most of the loans it serviced to Compass  
2 Partners, LLC and Compass Financial Partners, LLC (“Compass”), including the Bundy  
3 Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan. The sale to Compass closed on February 16, 2007.

4 The USACM Trust exists as of the Effective Date of the Plan, which was March 12,  
5 2007. Geoffrey L. Berman is the Trustee. Under the Plan, the USACM Trust is the  
6 successor to USACM with respect to standing to seek allowance and disallowance of  
7 Claims under 11 U.S.C. § 502(a).

8 Upon information derived from filings in the United States District Court, District  
9 of Nevada, *3685 San Fernando Lenders Company, LLC, et al v. Compass USA SPE, LLC,*  
10 *et al*, No. 2:07-cv-00892-RCJ-GWF action, the Trust believes that “Silar Advisors, LP  
11 (“Silar”) financed Compass’ acquisition of the Purchased Assets, including the loan  
12 service agreements in the USACM bankruptcy case and took a secured interest in those  
13 Purchased Assets by executing a Master Repurchase Agreement (“Repurchase  
14 Agreement”) with Compass, and by filing a UCC-1 financing statement with the State of  
15 Delaware.” *Id.* Docket 1250 at 13-14 (citations to declarations omitted).

16 Further, from filings in the same action, the Trust believes that “Effective as of  
17 September 26, 2007, Silar foreclosed on Compass through Asset Resolution LLC (“Asset  
18 Resolution”) and took ownership of the Purchased Assets. ... Silar created Asset  
19 Resolution as a ‘single purpose entity,’ conveyed all of its interests in the Repurchase  
20 Agreement to Asset Resolution, and Asset Resolution properly foreclosed on the assets of  
21 Compass, including the Purchased Assets.” (Citations omitted.) Asset Resolution LLC is  
22 now a debtor in a chapter 7 bankruptcy case pending in Nevada, case no. BK-S-09-32824-  
23 RCJ, along with certain affiliates.<sup>1</sup> By Order entered on July 19, 2010 by the Hon. Robert  
24

25 <sup>1</sup> 10 90 SPE LLC, Fiesta Stoneridge LLC, CFP Gramercy SPE LLC, Bundy 2.5 Million SPE LLC, CFP  
26 Cornman Toltec SPE LLC, Bundy Five Million LLC, Fox Hills SPE LLC, HFAH Monaco SPE LLC,  
Huntsville SPE LLC, Lake Helen Partners SPE LLC, Ocean Atlantic SPE LLC, CFP, Gess SPE LLC, CFP  
Clear Lake SPE LLC, and Shamrock SPE LLC.

1 C. Jones in the Asset Resolution Case, the servicing rights for 19 loans were transferred to  
2 Cross, FLS. The Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan, was among the loans whose  
3 servicing rights were transferred to Cross, FLS.

4 The Trust has attempted to monitor loan collections through monitoring the district  
5 court litigation and the ARC bankruptcy case, but has received limited information  
6 concerning servicing and resolution of direct loans by Compass/Silar/Asset Resolution or  
7 their successors, including the trustee in bankruptcy for Asset Resolution. The Trust has  
8 also been in contract with Cross FLS about certain loans that it is servicing, including the  
9 Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan. The following is the extent of the USACM Trust's  
10 information on the current servicing and status of the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan.

11 The following is the extent of the USACM Trust's information on the current  
12 servicing and status of the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan.

13 **b. The Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan**

14 USACM circulated an Offer Sheet to prospective Direct Lenders soliciting funding  
15 for an acquisition and development loan to a borrower identified as "Bundy Canyon Land  
16 Development, LLC." A copy of the Offer Sheet is attached hereto as **Exhibit B** and  
17 incorporated by this reference. (Berman Decl., ¶ 4.) The Offer Sheet stated that the  
18 Borrower was a joint venture between USA Investment Partners and three individuals,  
19 Dave Fogg,<sup>2</sup> Chris Pederson, and Kevin Everett. *Id.* The total loan amount proposed was  
20 \$2,500,000. *Id.* The Offer Sheet described the investment as a "First Trust Deed  
21 Investment" and noted that the investment would be secured by a first deed of trust on  
22 approximately 21.6 acres of property to be developed into approximately 85 lots, located  
23 on Bundy Canyon Road in Riverside County, California, near the city of Murietta. *Id.*

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>2</sup> David Fogg's involvement in the transfer of funds between the USA Capital Diversified Trust Deed Fund  
and USA Investment Partners was addressed in separate litigation. That litigation was settled and that  
settlement was approved by this Court.

1 The loan to value ratio was 29% based on the sell out price for the approved mapped lots.<sup>3</sup>

2 *Id.*

3 On May 2, 2005, Borrower made and delivered to various lenders, including the  
4 Direct Lenders identified in **Exhibit A**, a “Promissory Note Secured by Deed of Trust”  
5 (the “Note”) and a Loan Agreement (Berman Decl., ¶5.) The Note and Loan Agreement  
6 provided for a loan of up to \$2,500,000, with an initial loan in the amount of \$2,000,000.  
7 *Id.* Pursuant to the Loan Agreement, the loan was intended to acquire a portion of the real  
8 property, to refinance a portion of the real property, and to pay certain overhead of  
9 Borrower’s overhead expenses. *Id.* The Note was secured by a “Deed of Trust,  
10 Assignment of Rents, Security Agreement and Fixture Filing” (the “Deed of Trust”) from  
11 the Borrower in favor of the Direct Lenders that was recorded in the official records of  
12 Riverside County, California on May 27, 2005 at Instrument Number 20050424762, as  
13 were subsequent amendments to the Deed of Trust to secure subsequent loan advances.  
14 (Berman Decl. ¶ 5.) The Note was also supported by a guaranty from Tom Hantges and  
15 Joseph Milanowski. (Berman Decl., ¶ 6.)

16 The USACM “Loan Summary” dated July 31, 2006 and filed in this case shows  
17 that Borrower was “Non-Performing” on the Note as of July 31, 2006. (Berman  
18 Decl., ¶ 7.) During this bankruptcy case through the transfer of servicing to Compass,  
19 USACM treated the Direct Lenders with respect to any interim payments by the borrower  
20 in accordance with this Court’s orders and the confirmed Plan.

21 Counsel for the Trustee had a brief conversation with a representative of Cross,  
22 FLS regarding the status of the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan. In addition to serving  
23 the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan, Cross, FLS is also serving two others loans to  
24 Bundy Canyon that USACM originated. According to Cross, FLS, the collateral that

---

25  
26 <sup>3</sup> The Trustee has been unable to locate an appraisal for this loan and it does not appear that one was ever obtained.

1 secured the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan is now REO property. In addition,  
2 significant accrued taxes are owed on the property that served (or continues to serve) as  
3 collateral for the various Bundy Canyon loans, and those taxes may exceed the value of  
4 the collateral.

5 **c. The Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Claims**

6 **Exhibit A**, attached, lists Proofs of Claim filed by Direct Lenders that appear to be  
7 based entirely upon an investment in the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan.

8 (Burr Decl. ¶ 7.) **Exhibit A** identifies the Proof of Claim number, the claimant, the  
9 claimant's address, the total amount of the claim and the total amount of the claim that  
10 appears to be related to an investment in the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan based  
11 upon the information provided by the claimant. (Burr Declaration ¶ 7.) The claims  
12 listed in **Exhibit A** are referred to hereafter as the "Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million)  
13 Claims." As required by Nevada LR 3007, a copy of the first page of the proof of claim  
14 for each of the claims referenced in **Exhibit A** are attached as **Exhibit C**.

15 **II. JURISDICTION**

16 The Court has jurisdiction over this Objection pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1334 and  
17 157. Venue is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409. This matter is a core  
18 proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 502 and Bankruptcy Rule 3007.

19 The statutory predicates for the relief requested herein are 11 U.S.C. § 502 and  
20 Bankruptcy Rule 3007.

21 **III. APPLICABLE AUTHORITY**

22 Under the Bankruptcy Code, any Claim for which a proof of claim has been filed  
23 will be allowed unless a party in interest objects. If a party in interest objects to the proof  
24 of claim, the Court, after notice and hearing, shall determine the amount of the Claim and  
25 shall allow the Claim except to the extent that the Claim is "unenforceable against the  
26 debtor . . . under any . . . applicable law for a reason other than because such claim is

1 contingent or unmatured.” 11 U.S.C. § 502(b). A properly filed proof of claim is  
2 presumed valid under Bankruptcy Rule 3001(f). However, once an objection to the proof  
3 of claim controverts the presumption, the creditor ultimately bears the burden of  
4 persuasion as to the validity and amount of the claim. *See Ashford v. Consolidated*  
5 *Pioneer Mortg. (In re Consolidated Pioneer Mortg.)*, 178 B.R. 222, 226 (9th Cir. B.A.P.  
6 1995), *aff'd*, 91 F.3d 151 (9th Cir. 1996).

#### 7 IV. THE OBJECTION

8 USA Investment Partners (“USA IP”) held an interest in the Borrower and that  
9 interest was disclosed on the Offer Sheet described above and attached as **Exhibit B**. As  
10 such, and unlike many of the other loans brokered by USACM, the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5  
11 Million) Loan was not completely arms’ length. However, the Direct Lenders received the  
12 first position interest in the collateral securing the loan as promised by the Offer Sheet. In  
13 addition, the Direct Lenders took a known risk by investing in a promissory note secured  
14 by a lien on real property.

15 USACM is not liable for the Borrower’s default but the Trustee recognizes the  
16 potential conflict of interest arising from USACM’s brokering the loan for an affiliate,  
17 being the loan’s servicer and then potentially not acting diligently to demand payment  
18 from a defaulting borrower. USACM however is not responsible for any decrease in the  
19 value of the collateral.

20 In light of the potential conflict of interest, the trustee is prepared to allow a partial  
21 claim for the direct lenders that have filed proofs of claim arising from their investment in  
22 this (and the related Bundy Canyon loans) in an amount of 20% of the proof of claim. The  
23 balance of the direct lender’s proof of claim is otherwise objected to as the Direct Lenders  
24 fail to state a claim because USACM does not appear to have breached the loan servicing  
25 agreements with respect to collection of the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan. USACM  
26

1 was under no duty to foreclose on the collateral securing the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million)  
2 Loan or take any other action.

3 This objection will not affect the Direct Lenders' right to be repaid on the Bundy  
4 Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan by the Borrower, to recover from the sale of any collateral  
5 that secured the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan or share in any funds generated by  
6 enforcing the guaranty associated with the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan.

7 **V. CONCLUSION**

8 The USACM Trust respectfully requests that the Court disallow 80% of each claim  
9 listed in **Exhibit A** and allow the remaining 20% of each claim. Those claims are based  
10 entirely upon an investment in the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan. This objection  
11 concerns only the Bundy Canyon (\$2.5 Million) Loan and not any other claims of any of  
12 the Direct Lenders. The USACM Trust also requests such other and further relief as is just  
13 and proper.

14 DATED this 27th day of July, 2011.

15 LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

16 By s/ John Hinderaker (AZ 18024)  
17 Robert M. Charles, Jr., NV 6593  
18 John Hinderaker, AZ 18024 (*pro hac vice*)  
19 Marvin Ruth, NV 10979  
20 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
E-mail: JHinderaker@lrlaw.com  
Attorneys for the USACM Liquidating Trust

21 Copy of the foregoing and pertinent  
22 portion of Exhibits mailed by first  
class postage prepaid U.S. Mail on  
23 July 27, 2011 to all parties listed on  
Exhibit A attached.

24 LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

25

26 s/ Matt Burns